From: <u>McCarter, Jennifer</u>

To: <u>Bailley, Treasure</u>; <u>Churchill, Stephen</u>

Cc: Jacobson, Linda; Pearson, Janice (she/her/hers); Muller, Sheldon; Kilty, Quinn V; Bloomberg, Jon H

Subject: RE: Xcel Comanche: Additional Information Sought by EPA

 Date:
 Monday, April 19, 2021 6:44:24 PM

 Attachments:
 Comanche slides 04132021 Rev 0419.pdf

Hi Treasure and Steve, Attached are the slides presented in our April 13, 2021 call with EPA. While not the primary focus of that call, we did include and present information on the new cross-sections requested by EPA. Since you were not on that call, I've made revisions to summarize the relevant content of that presentation, so that you have that information in advance of our call this Thursday, April 22nd.

- Slides 2-4 annotated for clarification
- Slide 5 added to summarize discussion of new cross-sections
- Slides 8-9 added to summarize observations that support no 'off-site impacts'

I'll also forward to you the tables of all results to date for all wells which I sent to Sheldon last week.

Jennifer McCarter, R.E.M.

Xcel Energy

Environmental Analyst

Environmental Services Department

1800 Larimer St., Suite 1300, Denver, CO 80202-1414 P: 303-294-2228 C: 720-810-1220 F: 303-294-2328

E: jennifer.mccarter@xcelenergy.com

XCELENERGY.COM

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Muller, Sheldon < Muller. Sheldon@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 2:52 PM

To: McCarter, Jennifer < jennifer.mccarter@xcelenergy.com>

Cc: Bloomberg, Jon H < Jon.H.Bloomberg@xcelenergy.com>; Kilty, Quinn V

<quinn.v.kilty@xcelenergy.com>

Subject: RE: Xcel Comanche: Additional Information Sought by EPA

EXTERNAL - STOP & THINK before opening links and attachments.

Jennifer:

This responds to your March 26, 2021 email below regarding the north-south cross sections. With respect to those cross sections, EPA's expectations and understandings, at this point, are:

- 1. That Xcel should have pertinent information from both the wells on-site at the Comanche Generating Station and the well drillers logs from the domestic wells. Although our expectation is that the driller logs for the domestic wells will not be as detailed as those for the on-site wells, they should contain enough information related to depth-to bedrock and the overburden materials to make some educated correlations to aid our understanding regarding the relationship of on-site conditions to the domestic wells. At least one geologic map (Scott, 1969) covering the area is available.
- 2. We expect that local topographic and geologic maps will be used to inform vertically exaggerated cross section(s), in addition to the information gained from the wells. Geologic contacts should be ground-truthed where necessary and possible.
- 3. The local known geology should be used to inform the relationships at depth. The geologic

map (Scott, 1969) does have strike-and-dip measurements for Pierre Shale outcrops near the domestic wells and information regarding structural features that would influence conditions at depth. There may be more recent or more detailed maps available for the area, and if so, those should be referenced, but, in any event, the cross section(s) should not rely on well-derived subsurface data alone.

EPA may request additional information from Xcel in this regard as we move forward.

Sheldon

Sheldon H. Muller | Senior Assistant Regional Counsel

Legal Enforcement Branch | Regulatory Enforcement Section

Office of Regional Counsel | U.S. EPA, Region 8 1595 Wynkoop St. | Denver, CO 80202-1129

Phone: (303) 312-6916 Fax: (303) 312-6953 muller.sheldon@epa.gov

From: McCarter, Jennifer < jennifer.mccarter@xcelenergy.com>

Sent: Friday, March 26, 2021 10:37 AM

To: Muller, Sheldon < <u>Muller.Sheldon@epa.gov</u>>

Cc: Bloomberg, Jon H < <u>Jon.H.Bloomberg@xcelenergy.com</u>>; Kilty, Quinn V

<quinn.v.kilty@xcelenergy.com>

Subject: RE: Xcel Comanche: Additional Information Sought by EPA

Hi Sheldon, I wanted to respond to your questions (see below), even though we are still compiling some of the information. We expect to have the follow up information to EPA the first full week in April. We would also like to respond to the request EPA made on our call to develop a north to south cross section from our site to the St. Charles River. As we stated, to create a true cross section would require extensive borings over this distance of about one mile. However we have asked our consultants to compile the available data on the off-site wells and provide a graphic illustration of this data relative to our on-site CCR units and wells, which we believe will provide the 'generalized' view that EPA requested.

Thank you,

Jennifer McCarter, R.E.M.

Xcel Energy

Environmental Analyst Environmental Services Department

1800 Larimer St., Suite 1300, Denver, CO 80202-1414 P: 303-294-2228 C: 720-810-1220 F: 303-294-2328

E: jennifer.mccarter@xcelenergy.com

XCELENERGY.COM

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Muller, Sheldon < Muller. Sheldon@epa.gov >

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 12:39 PM

To: McCarter, Jennifer < <u>iennifer.mccarter@xcelenergy.com</u>>

Cc: Bloomberg, Jon H < Jon.H.Bloomberg@xcelenergy.com >; Kilty, Quinn V

<quinn.v.kilty@xcelenergy.com>

Subject: Xcel Comanche: Additional Information Sought by EPA

EXTERNAL - STOP & THINK before opening links and attachments.

Jennifer:

Below is the additional information that we would like.

- 1. Table of sampling results to date for all wells, with associated lab reports (no need to re-send the reports that are available in the 2020 GW Monitoring Report). We are in the process of preparing more 'user friendly' formatted tables, in addition to the data export table previously provided to EPA. We expect to be able to complete and send those the first full week in April, and will include any lab reports not previously provided.
- 2. Relative ratio of CCR vs. non-CCR waste into Bottom Ash Pond, prior to cessation of non-CCR waste. As mentioned in our call last week, prior to cessation of the non-CCR waste that was going to the bottom ash pond, the non-CCR waste represented approximately 7% of the total waste going to the pond at that time. We ceased discharging non-CCR waste to the bottom ash pond on January 28, 2021.
- 3. Any reason that the volume of CCR waste into Bottom Ash Pond might change? We would not expect any increase in CCR waste volume into the pond. The estimate of bottom ash solids previously provided was based on a five year average, and most of those solids are captured in the upstream concrete bunker. In the last year, we have seen the generation load decrease as more renewables are brought on line, and expect to see more of that over the next five years up to retirement of Unit 2. This would result in lower CCR waste volume into the bunker and pond.

Sheldon

Sheldon H. Muller | Senior Assistant Regional Counsel Legal Enforcement Branch | Regulatory Enforcement Section Office of Regional Counsel | U.S. EPA, Region 8 1595 Wynkoop St. | Denver, CO 80202-1129

Phone: (303) 312-6916 Fax: (303) 312-6953 muller.sheldon@epa.gov

ECN: 510.0003.2021_XcelComanche